DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 496 JC 840 025

TITLE Education Policy Committee Report to the Spring 1981 Conference.
INSTITUTION Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE [83]
NOTE 19p.; Document contains small type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); Basic Skills; *Community Colleges; Educational Diagnosis; *Faculty Organizations; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; State Universities; *Testing Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Senate for California Community Colleges; *California

ABSTRACT

The Education Policy Committee's actions and recommendations are presented regarding resolutions passed at the fall 1981 conference of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). First, a resolution recommending the pursuit of departmental articulation agreements with state colleges and universities is addressed. Statewide articulation activities are detailed next, including those of the Articulation Council, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the California Roundtable for Higher Education, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, the Chancellor's Office of California Community Colleges, and the ASCCC. Committee recommendations concerning articulation at the local level are followed by a listing of ASCCC resolutions passed between 1979 and 1981 concerning articulation. Committee analyses, responses, and recommendations are presented next for ASCCC resolutions regarding the Educational Code's amended definition of "students who can profit from instruction"; expectations of high school students entering community colleges with respect to course work; and procedures to identify and remediate deficiencies in basic reading, writing, or math competencies. Finally, results are summarized from an ASCCC survey of community college testing practices. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED238496

THE ACADEMIC SENATE
for California Community Colleges

Education Policy Committee Report
to
The Spring 1981 Conference

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. LaRoche

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UC 840 025

Several resolutions passed at the Fall 1981 Conference of the Academic Senate were referred to our committee for study and implementation. In the following pages the committee reports its actions and recommendations regarding these items and welcomes further instructions from the conference.

The committee wishes to express special thanks to Edith Conn and Phil Hartley for their cooperation in gathering data and information used in this report.

Educational Policy Committee

Leon P. Baradat, Chair	MiraCosta
Alexandrina Esparza	San Jose City
Richard Fairchild	Long Beach City
Alfredo Mendoza	L.A. Southwest
Susan Petit	College of San Mateo

Local Senates/Basic Competencies

Resolution #5

M/S/R*C (G. Gerard, Solano/ R. Castillo, San Mateo; M. Snowhite, Crafton Hills; N. Bischof, Merritt; J. Hatoff, MiraCosta)

BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate pursue departmental articulation agreements with CSUC and UC to seek commonality among the three segments of higher education.

This resolution presented the committee with a substantial challenge. Clearly, the statewide Academic Senate lacks the resources to become heavily involved in articulation at the departmental level at 106 colleges in the state. In reviewing the question, the committee agreed that perhaps its greatest service to the local Academic Senates and the various college departments would be to present a paper detailing the activities and institutions presently engaged in articulation. In this endeavor we asked Edith Conn, who knows more than anyone else cares to about accreditation, for information. The committee is indeed grateful for her contribution on the subject and the material below is largely an extraction from her submissions.

The articulation process is an incredibly complex and largely redundant morass of institutions which exist and activities which take place at every level of our profession. This paper hopes to give the reader a better idea of what is being done in articulation, at what level it is done, and who presumes to do it. The paper goes on to make several recommendations based upon the committee's findings.

Statewide Activities In Articulation

Articulation Council - Begun by the University of California in 1919, the Articulation Council later (1978) came to be administered by CCJCA. In 1981, CCJCA relinquished this responsibility to a private consulting firm headed by Lloyd Messersmith. The council includes representation from the various segments of higher education and its principal function seems to be to facilitate articulation among the segments. That so many other articulation activities at the state level have emerged since its founding may indicate that the Council has been unable to completely satisfy felt needs.

CPEC - The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) has initiated several efforts in areas which relate to articulation. Most specifically CPEC has organized the Task Force on Admissions and Articulation under the leadership of Dr. Dorothy Knowl This taskforce tries to anticipate possible problems in admissions and articulations and deals with them by providing a forum in which representatives of the various segments can come together and discuss mutual concerns.

California Roundtable for Higher Education - In 1980, the CPEC Director, the President of UC, the Chancellors of CSU and CCC, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction came together in the California Roundtable for Higher Education. This group discusses mutual problems which presumably include articulation. Notably, this group has supported the efforts of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates to develop a statement on basic skills expectations for entering freshmen.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates - In 1979 representatives of the statewide Academic Senates from UC, CSU, and CCC began meeting on issues which concerned their faculties. The committee has developed a major statement of expectations for entering freshmen in basic skills which has been endorsed by each respective senate and is now being publicized throughout the state. The committee has also met with high school representatives in an effort to solicit their cooperation. Future work of this committee will probably address expectations in other fields beyond basic skills. There has also been discussion about developing uniform definitions for baccalaureate level courses.

Beyond institutions dealing with articulation among the three segments of higher education and the high schools, there are also several groups which deal with articulation in a bilateral forum.

UC-CCC - The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) includes a subcommittee for articulation with community colleges. Composed of UC faculty and two community college representatives (one administrator and one faculty member), this committee addresses questions of admissions requirements and related matters of articulation for community college transfer students.

CSU-CCC - Community college articulation with CSU is more complex. The Joint Advisory Committee on Transfer Issues (JACOTI), composed of administrators and faculty from both segments, discusses articulation questions of a general nature. Two CSU Academic Senate committees on which community college faculty have participated deal with more specific issues. The Ad Hoc Committee on Executive Order 167 dealt with transfer course designation and monitoring, while the General Education Breadth Advisory Committee developed the recent change in GE requirements at CSU.

The Chancellor's Office - The Chancellor's office is active in articulation matters, enjoying representation to most of the state level commissions and taskforces mentioned above. It also has created several advisory committees which deal with questions on articulation like that on GE, Credit/Non-credit, and transfer issues.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges - (The attachment to this report is the resolutions on articulation passed by the Academic Senate since 1978). The statewide Academic Senate has played an important role in articulation in recent years. While president of the Academic Senate, Norbert Bischof was instrumental in organizing the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates and Barbara Hinkley was particularly responsible for drawing together the final draft of its report on basic skills expectations. The Academic Senate sends representatives to the CPEC Task Force on Admissions and Articulation, the BOARS Subcommittee of Articulation with Community Colleges, JACOTI, the CSU Committee on 167, and its General Education Breadth Advisory Committee. Additionally, the Academic Senate has appointed people to act as liaison with the Academic Senates of UC and CSU and a regular liaison exists between the chairs of the Educational Policy Committees for the senates of CSU and CCC. The Academic Senate also hosted two regional articulation meetings with CSU and UC in 1981. A major objective of the Academic Senate is to become the appointing body of the community college faculty representatives on the Articulation Council. Presently faculty representatives to the Council from UC and CSU are appointed by their respective Academic Senates. For community colleges, however, the archaic practice of receiving appointees from CCJCA still obtains. The Articulation Council is the only statewide committee on articulation to which people purported to represent faculty are not chosen by the organization which officially represents faculty. Clearly this practice must change.

CCJCA - The California Community and Junior College Association (CCJCA) maintains a large superstructure of committees dealing with articulation. Its Articulation Commission administered the Articulation Council from 1978 to 1980 and some of its members still sit on the Council. CCJCA also has several subcommittees on general education, continuing education, instruction, etc., which deal with articulation. Presently, CCJCA appoints all community college representatives (including faculty representatives) to the Articulation Council, save those from the Chancellor's office

Articulation at the Local Level

Despite the work done at the state level, the simple truth of the matter is that the most important part of the articulation process is done at the local level. Each college has an articulation officer. Normally the position is assigned by the administration to one of their own or to a faculty member, usually on the counseling staff. This individual is responsible for developing the articulation agreements for his/her college (multi-college districts sometimes deal with this on a district level and the various institutions within the UC and CSU systems.

Departmental articulation is a hit or miss operation. In most cases no departmental articulation occurs in a formal sense. Apparently, depending upon the individuals involved and upon the preceived need for it, some departmental articulata may occur but such contacts are usually informal, voluntary affairs. To the Ed. Policy Committee's knowledge, there is no compulsory department to department articulation between the CCCs and UC or CSU. Interestingly, we found that there is even very little interdepartmental coordination at some colleges within our own system and, in a few cases, precious little coordination occurs within given departments on the same CC campus.

The committee finds that the need for articulation between departments at CCC, (and UC will probably differ from field to field as well as from campus to campus. There is little question, however, that the local academic senates could profitably become more involved in articulation. To facilitate a more effective articulation process the committee offers the following recommendations and advice.

1. The morass of articulation groups at the state level should probably be streamlined so as to reduce the present duplication of effort as much as possible.

2. Local academic senates could establish subcommittees on accreditation which include the college articulation officers. If articulation is done on a district-wide basis, the district senate could create such a subcommittee. This committee could coordinate the accreditation process and foster department to department articualtion as necessary.

3. Host articulation meetings with the faculties of the colleges and universities to which most of your students transfer. Since the specific issues between the CC colleges and departments and CSU often differ from those between CC colleges and departments and UC, we encourage that separate articulation meetings be held with each segment. This will take more time but the results of such meetings are likely to be more satisfactory.

Besides actually organizing articulation meetings, the most difficult thing to do is get beyond the awkward moments at the beginning of the meeting. We suggest that this problem will be minimized if you publish a tentative agenda prior to the meeting and that you specify those items which you are most eager to address.

Some topics which may be included are listed below in an "ask them" "tell them" format.

Ask Them:

-- To compare syllabi of basic courses;

-- To explain the philosophical approach they take in those courses;

-- To specify the skills students should learn in those courses;

-- To specify the subject matter beyond the immediate topics which students encounter in those courses;

-- To list the texts used and to explain how they are chosen;

-- To indicate what our students do well in and in which areas they have trouble;

-- To specify their class sizes;

-- To specify the resources available to them (e.g. TA's readers, tutoring, etc.);

-- To cooperate with you in creating better integrated programs.

Tell Them:

-- All the above about your courses;

-- Which university practices and requirements cause you undue problems or impede your students unfairly;

-- What freshman-sophomore material has been unfairly elevated to upper division status and why such practices are wrong.

We should remember, however, that although this resolution was directed toward articulation between institutions of higher education, we must also involve ourselves with the high schools in efforts to help them adequately prepare their students for college.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

RESOLUTIONS ON ARTICULATION 1979 - 1981

(1) BE IT RESOLVED that all courses certified as meeting general education requirements for transfer be comparable to existing courses at CSUC or UC for articulation purposes, and also

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Committee develop appropriate means of articulation. (Spring, 1979)

(2) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate endorse continued community college certification of courses for transfer to CSUC for general education purposes, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that guidelines and procedures applicable to all community college for the certification of General Education units for transfer to CSUC contain procedures for the challenge of community college certification of courses. (Fall, 1979)

(3) WHEREAS, the Joint Advisory Committee on Transfer Issues has not functioned in the last two years,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate is directed to investigate the reasons with the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and request the reactivation of this useful method of communication between the CSUC system and the community colleges. (Fall, 1979)

Note: According to the Senate annual report, 1981, JOCATI met three times during 1980-1981.

(4) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate reaffirm its position of Spring, 1979 that all courses certified as meeting general education requirements for transfer be comparable to existing courses at CSUC or UC for articulation purposes, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Academic Senate develop an appropriate mechanism for articulation with CSUC and UC faculty. (Spring, 1980)

(5) BE IT RESOLVED that the Educational Policies Committee of the Academic Senate be directed to develop criteria by which courses may be selected for inclusion in the general education pattern, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this list of criteria be recommended to each local senate. (Spring, 1980)

(6) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate executive committee recommend that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges establish guidelines that will enable local senates to participate in the process of certifying courses for transfer. (Spring, 1980)

(7) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate reaffirm its position that the California Community Colleges with their unique instructional capabilities continue to provide transfer programs for those students who can profit from these programs. (Spring, 1980)

(8) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate urge the maintenace of the transfer program in order to provide the opportunity for these students to acquire a quality education. (Spring, 1980)

(9) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend that local senates establish community support committees to promote their transfer programs, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the California Chancellor's Office also establish an advisory committee to study transfer programs. (Spring, 1980)

(10) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate urge that the California Community Colleges redouble their efforts to recruit students for the transfer program, a traditional and vital component of their basic educational mission. (Spring, 1980)

(11) WHEREAS, some statistics suggest a decline in the percentage of transfer students from the California Community Colleges, and

WHEREAS, one reason for such decline may be increasing competition for high school students among all segments of higher education, and

WHEREAS, four-year institutions are actively recruiting in high schools as early as the junior year,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate encourage local senates to promote high school recruitment programs specifically aimed at the recruitment of transfer students. (Spring, 1980)

(12) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate encourage California Community Colleges to require transcripts of recent high school graduates. (Spring, 1980)

(13) WHEREAS it is vital that articulation discussions take place between instructional faculties at community colleges and four-year institutions,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate urge local academic senates to establish joint articulation committees with those four-year institutions that receive their students for the purpose of discussing procedures for articulation, and

BE IT RESOLVED that these joint articulation committees also discuss transfer courses and programs with relation to course content and course equivalency. (Spring, 1980)

(14) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend to local academic senates that all college catalog course descriptions include a statement indicating if a course is transferable to the CSUC or the UC system. (Spring, 1980)

(15) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate support the position that California Community Colleges certify which of their courses are baccalaureate level and thus transferable to the University of California and California State University and College systems. (Fall, 1980)

(16) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend to all local senates that they establish procedures by which courses certified as transfer level are reviewed by the faculty to insure that these courses are of sufficient academic rigor to deserve baccalaureate level status. (Fall, 1980)

(17) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate encourage local senates to coordinate departmental/division faculty contacts with CSUC and UC so that comparable academic standards for transfer courses prevail. (Fall, 1980)

(18) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate seek to establish a workshop with the UC and CSUC faculty in order to establish commonality on specific transfer courses in terms of articulation, content, and criteria, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Academic Senate initiate regional faculty articulation meetings concerning transfer programs and courses and initiate meetings of faculty of the same discipline from all three segments. (Fall, 1980)

(19) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate support the resolution of the English Council of California Two-Year Colleges (ECCTYC) that community college faculties insure that the transfer certification of the written communication requirement of the newly adopted CSUC General Education Requirements be at least one term of the traditional freshman composition course, i.e. English 1A. (Fall, 1980)

(20) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate affirm that courses or programs in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) be offered with appropriate credit, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that transferability of these courses/programs be established by means of the standard articulation procedures between the community colleges and the four-year institutions, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that one provision necessary for granting transferability to courses or programs in ESOL be that these courses or programs are equivalent in educational respects to those offered at accredited four-year institutions. (Fall, 1980)

(21) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend to local senates that they make every effort to insure that public relations and recruitment activities for transfer programs and courses are not ignored and are given proper expenditure of funds and time. (Fall, 1980)

(22) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate encourage local senates to urge the members of the instructional faculty to make contact with secondary school teachers and students in an effort to improve preparation. (Fall, 1980)

(23) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate prepare a response to the Kissler Report and that it be circulated to major newspapers in California. (Fall, 1980)

The Kissler report is a report on the UCLA Community College Student Survey Project and The Report of the Task Group on Retention and Transfer. The Senate response written by Maryamber Villa was widely circulated and discussed.

(24) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend that representatives to the Articulation Council of California and its liaison committees shall be appointed by the Academic Senate, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend to local faculty senates that the appointment or articulation officers of the individual colleges shall be subject to approval of the respective senates. (Spring, 1981)

(25) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate strongly urge local faculty senates to establish intersegmental discipline-specific forums involving the high schools, community colleges, CSUC, and UC campuses within the geographical area to discuss mutual curricular interests. (The Academic Senate suggests the responsibility for developing the mechanisms for providing these forums might be assigned to a transfer committee established by the local faculty senate.), and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CCC, CSUC, and UC Intersegmental Academic Senate Committee be requrested to develop models of these intersegmental, regional, discipline-specific forums. (Spring, 1981)

(26) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate support the proposal of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Subcommittee for Articulation with Community Colleges that no exemption be allowed to the English and mathematics components in the A-F requirements for community college students who are transferring to the University of California. (Spring, 1981)

(27) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate strongly recommend that the University of California not implement an early admission policy for community college transfer students. (Spring, 1981)

(28) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate strongly request that the Board of Governors of the CCC require that all students registering who indicate either the goal of obtaining an associate degree or transferring to CSUC or UC be required to file a transcript of their high school course work with the college. (Spring, 1981)

(29) WHEREAS there has been a spirit of cooperation between the CSUC General Education-Breadth Committee and various segments of the community college family in the development of the Executive Order on General Education and Certification, and

WHEREAS the approval of the Academic Senate was elicited, through its representative, at each stage, and

WHEREAS, the final document represents an acceptable and workable instrument,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate accept this document and express its appreciation to the CSUC General Education Advisory Committee and the CSUC Academic Senate for the spirit of collegiality in which it was developed. (Spring, 1981)

(30) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate endorse the principles of the position paper written by the Intersegmental Senate Committee on basic competencies in English and mathematics. (Fall, 1981)

(31) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate reaffirm its previous position endorsing the practice of requiring high school transcripts of entering students. (Fall, 1981)

(32) BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate pursue departmental articulation agreements with CSUC and UC to seek commonality among the three segments of higher education. (Referred to Educational Policy Committee - Fall, 1981)

(33) BE IT RESOLVED that the statewide Academic Senate establish an articulation committee to begin dialogue with the K-12 system regarding methods of achieving student competence in basic skills; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that local academic senates be urged to set up articulation groups with appropriate K-12 faculty and administration. (Fall, 1981)

(34) BE IT RESOLVED that each senate be encouraged to establish liaison with its local 4-year colleges and universities for the task of determining, acquiring, evaluating, and disseminating valid and meaningful follow-up data on community college transfer students. (Fall, 1981)

Local Senate/Basic Competencies

Resolution #4

M/S/R*C (N. Bischof, Merritt/S. Ruis, Skyline; R. Castillo, College of San Mateo; L. Williams, Yuba; M. Snowhite, Crafton Hills)

BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommend that the Educational Code be amended to define "Students who can profit from instruction..." as

a. having passed their high school proficiency test,

b. having a high school diploma,

c. having passed an exam equivalent to the high school proficiency test approved by the local community college faculty.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the above apply to students who have acquired 9 or more units.

The intention of this resolution is to advise high school students that they should take their preparation for college seriously. Items a. and b. of the first resolve apply to students coming to the community colleges from high school. Item c. of the first resolve and the second resolve address adult students and foreign students. It suggests that those students could take as many as 9 units of remedial work in preparation for qualifying for further community college work by means of passing an examination developed by the college faculty. Presumably, students who, after taking 9 units of remedial work, could not pass the exam would no longer be allowed to attend the community college.

The committee feels that the implications of this issue are so complex that it should be debated more completely before Title 5 language is suggested to the Board of Governors. To facilitate the debate, the committee has prepared a list of positive and negative features regarding the proposal.

Positive Features:

-- The examination approved by the community college faculty could be a vehicle by which faculty could become more directly involved in student, course, and program assessment.

-- The range of abilities in our classes would be narrowed if there were assurances that each student admitted possessed minimum basic skills.

-- The faculty would become actively involved with high school articulation.

-- Such Title 5 language would be a clear signal to high school students that standards are being implemented and must be complied with.

-- These standards would reinforce the transfer programs.

-- This could be the first step in a more extensive assessment program which could be helpful to students in selecting courses.

-- Such a policy would help delineate the adult education function from other community college roles.

-- It could encourage high schools to reevaluate the basis upon which they grant diplomas.

-- It could encourage the high schools to create more demanding proficiency exams.

-- It would require that community colleges assume responsibility for assessment.

Negative Features:

-- It seems to prevent high school students from taking community college courses while still in high school.

-- It applies to full-time and part-time students and would therefore be difficult to implement.

-- It effectively requires a transcript or placement test for all students.

-- It would probably prevent only the very weakest students from entering college courses and therefore may not be worth all the time, trouble, and expense.

-- It could impede students with limited English abilities who generally take transfer ESL courses.

-- Developing the local test would be difficult because of varying perceptions among faculty as to the necessary level of difficulty.

-- It could be embarrassing to offer tests for college entrance requiring 8th or even 7th grade competencies.(like those of the high school competency tests).

-- Because there is no statewide standard for the level of the tests, colleges with difficult tests could lose students who seek easier entrance requirements.

-- The testing program could create a costly bureaucratic monster and draw away scarce funds which might better be applied elsewhere.

-- Implementation of this proposal would open community colleges to charges of elitism and racism.

-- Implementation could damage our remediation commitment.

-- Because the resolution identifies levels of remediation, it could be used to establish which courses are remedial for funding purposes.

-- This may be a bad time for such a policy, when remediation functions are being disputed among high schools, adult education schools, and community colleges.

-- This would be the first time the "open door" (i.e. the right to enroll at a community college) would be closed to students on academic ground.

-- What will happen to students who cannot meet these entrance requirements? Where will they go for an education?

Local Senates/Basic Competencies

Resolution #6

M/S/C (J. Hubbell, Pierce/V. Akashian, Mesa; S. Ruis, Skyline; R. Castillo, College of San Mateo; G. Ramsey, Sacramento)

BE IT RESOLVED that for the next conference, the Educational Policy Committee of the Academic Senate prepare a statement delineating expectations high school students should meet to enter community colleges:

--four years of English composition
--two years of high school mathematics
--two years of high school science
--two years of foreign language
--two years of oral communication
--two years of social science

The committee is also concerned about the potential negative impact of this resolution. We certainly have no qualm about its intention, but we would advise a more tactful procedure than that implied in the resolution.

The committee believes care should be taken in communicating a course list to the high schools. It is essential that we enjoy the cooperation of the high schools in reaching our goal of better prepared students. We are colleagues attempting to solve problems of articulation, and as such we should strive for mutual agreements on issues common to us.

The community college faculty has historically worked with CSUC and UC faculties to arrive at mutual solutions to common problems. We have resisted mandates from the four-year institutions and have challenged them whenever we felt that they were attempting to dictate our curriculum. We should certainly extend the same consideration to our high school colleagues which we demand from our brethren at the four-year colleges and universities. This is not to say that we should invite the high schools to establish our standards, but we must be prepared to work with them in a cooperative and professional manner. To operate differently would be to contradict the tenets of collegiality and would be contrary to the best interests of education in California.

With this note of caution, the following are course lists which may be considered as possible preparatory programs for college bound high school students.

Program A

8 semesters of English composition
2 semesters of elementary algebra
2 semesters of intermediate algebra
2 semesters of biology
2 semesters of physics or chemistry
4 semesters of a single foreign language
4 semesters of oral communication
2 semesters of world history
2 semesters of U.S. history
28 semester classes

Program B

4 semesters of English composition
2 semesters of American/British literatu including composition
2 semesters of elementary algebra
2 semesters of intermediate algebra
2 semesters of biology
2 semesters of physics or chemistry
4 semesters of foreign language
2 semesters of world history
1 semester of oral communication
1 semester of American history
1 semester of American government
23 semester classes

Program C

4 semesters of English composition
2 semesters of American/British literature including composition
2 semesters of elementary algebra
2 semesters of intermediate algebra
2 semesters of biology
2 semesters of foreign language
1 semester of oral communication
1 semester of American history
1 semester of American government
2 semesters of world history
19 semester classes

Obviously, innumerable combinations of these courses could be worked out. Note that American government has been added to programs B and C since it remains a requirement in most high schools today.

In studying this question, the committee discovered several difficulties such a proposal will encounter and we offer them for your consideration at this point.

1. Due to funding consideration, some high schools have reduced their offerings to 5 hours per day and it is anticipated that financial pressures will cause even more high schools to follow this course in the near future. Hence, high school students may have as few as 40 semester courses in which to complete their requirements. If as many as 28 semester courses are taken up on requirements, only 14 semesters could be left for such courses as PE, music, art, driver's training, voc. ed., and other electives. (It should be noted that state law requires 2 years of PE, a course in U.S. history and a course in U.S. government for all high school students.) Therefore, requiring as many as 28 semester courses may be unwise, or even unrealistic.

2. It is likely that some, or even many, high schools do not have staff capable of offering all the required courses in the above programs.

3. If levels of preparation are specified for high school students, we may find that anything below that level becomes defined as remedial, although the question of pace and style of instruction could help make the distinction; for example, foreign language study traditionally may begin either in high school or in college. Also, if students do become better prepared for college classes, staffing changes would need to be made: remedial English classes would be less in demand, for example, and that could result in loss of jobs. We should be aware of these implications in any recommendation we make. However, positive results should include better prepared students and greater enrollment in more advanced classes.

The committee strongly feels that more consultation with high school personnel is necessary before this issue is brought to final form. We suggest the following as possible steps to accomplish this consultation.

1. Utilize the existing vehicle between high schools and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

2. Create an ad hoc committee of the statewide Academic Senate to meet with high school personnel on curriculum development.

3. Create regional articulation councils between local Academic Senates and their feeder high schools.

4. Create subcommittees in local Academic Senates to meet with faculties of feeder high schools.

5. The Academic Senates of each college could delineate and publish expectations for students entering specific programs.

6. Each local Academic Senate could follow the example of the BOARS committee of the University of California by communicating its expectations for entering freshmen to parents of 8th graders.

Local Senates/Basic Competencies

Resolution #7

M/S/C (C. Ruis, Skyline/G. Gerard, Solano; N. Bischof, Merritt; T. Marre, Santa Monica; B. Silverman, Santa Monica)
40 ayes, 17 nays, 2 abstentions

BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate work with local senates to devise procedures whereby deficiencies in basic reading, writing, and math competencies can be identified and remediated before students are enrolled in transfer courses as well as in AA and AS degree programs/courses.

Again the committee finds that the sweeping nature of this resolution might fail to take cognizance of certain difficulties contained therein. The committee asks whether all competencies need be met prior to enrolling in any transfer class. Is it essential that a student's deficiencies in mathematics be remediated before he/she is allowed to enroll in English, music, social science, or art courses? Perhaps a better approach would be for departments to establish specific prerequisites for transfer courses. These prerequisites might be satisfied by placement tests, reading levels, course work, etc.

We recommend that the prerequisites be phased in over a reasonable length of time for the following reasons.

1. If present circumstances continue, the number of students who will need remedial work before entering transfer level courses will be overwhelming.

2. Such added demands for remedial work will likely necessitate retraining many of our faculty for reassignment into remedial courses.

3. The resulting vacancies in transfer courses will place heavy pressures to cancel them, thus reducing further our emphasis on the transfer functions. The administration must make a commitment to a full program before this measure is enacted.

4. Like several issues in other parts of this report, it would be wise for our faculties to communicate our intention to increase expectations for in-coming students. If high schools and parents are given adequate lead time, the adverse impact upon our programs can be minimized.

In an effort to grasp what kind of competency assessment is now being done at the community colleges, the committee asked Phil Hartley, Chair of the Academic Senate Research Committee to poll the colleges on the question. The committee wishes to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Hartley for his prompt cooperation in this matter and we offer the results of the survey as background information. The survey was sent to the presidents of each Academic Senate and 60.4% of the colleges responded.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE
for California Community Colleges

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TESTING PRACTICES

Submitted by
Phil Hartley

Many faculty in the California Community Colleges have expressed interest in the use of academic diagnostic testing to meet the challenge imposed by the great heterogeneity of academic skills present in our student population. In response to this interest, the State Academic Senate has undertaken a study of such testing practices in the California Community Colleges. As part of that undertaking, a survey of testing practices was conducted in the early part of 1982 to provide some insight into statewide practices.

About 60.4% of the colleges surveyed responded (64 colleges). Of these, 96% used some form of academic diagnostic testing on their campus. Over 50% of the colleges required at least one type of test be taken by at least all of their full-time students. Another 39.2% of the colleges indicated that they did academic skills testing, but the tests were voluntary though students are routinely encouraged to take the test or tests. Only 9.8% indicated that such tests were available but students were not required or encouraged to take them.

Clearly the most common academic skills test given was for English as 86% of the colleges that do testing indicated they administer such a test. Math was the second most common response to type of test given (70%) and reading tests were administered by 48% of the colleges doing testing.

Tests are most often administered at the beginning of each term (54.1%), on demand (29.7%) or upon admission to the college (8.1%). An interesting idea was suggested by two colleges who reported that they administer placement tests in their feeder high schools.

Many (41.3%) colleges require appropriate scores on a skill test for entrance into one or more of their transfer courses other than the baccalaureate level English course and 81.2% restrict entrance into the English course.

Frequently given entrance exams, other than English, were for math (48.4%), the health professions (35.5%) and chemistry/physics (22.6%). In all, 60.8% of the colleges reported use of other types of entrance exams in addition to the English palcement exam.

In contrast to the widespread use of basic skill testing, achievement tests as a requirement for graduation are relatively rare with only six colleges (9%) reporting such a practice. These exit tests were either in English or Math.

Most community colleges seem to recognize the need to use academic testing in order to help place students into courses that will best reflect their ability and need. Almost half of the colleges have not taken the step of making their testing program mandatory, however, and achievement tests as a graduation requirement are a rare practice in the California Community Colleges.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

FEB 10 1984